

Appl. No. 10/805,906  
Amdt. dated May 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

#### REMARKS

Applicant is filing this response to answer the outstanding Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application. Entry of the above amendments and following comments is respectfully requested before such reconsideration.

Claims 1-2 remain in this application.


Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, Claim 1 recited the limitation "said mesh top panel" in lines 12, 14 and 17. Applicant has deleted the term "mesh" in Claim 1 thereby overcoming examiner's objection.

Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-12 of U.S. patent No. 6,708,514 in view of Henseler (DE 4121659). To overcome this rejection, applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer, attached hereto. Applicant is the owner of both the instant application as well as U.S. Patent No. 6,708,514.

Appl. No. 10/805,906  
Amdt. dated May 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,




John P. McGonagle  
Reg. No. 30,196

800 Hingham Street - 2N  
Rockland, MA 02370  
781-871-4000

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

May 5, 2006



John P. McGonagle  
Attorney for Applicant